In the discussion to follow we have to critically discuss the role of different variables in creating the conditions that lead to alienation of the entire people or a segment of the people from the political system.

The variables to be discussed can be considered in the context of the flow model of the political system proposed by Easton. Easton (1964) considered a political system to have a relationship of exchange and reciprocity with the environment. The environment is divided by Easton into two main components, i.e., the intra-social environment and the extra societal environment. The intra-social environment includes ecological system, biological system, personality system and social system and the extra societal environment comprises of international political system, international ecological system and international social system. Influences emanating from these two environmental sources enter into a political system in the form of demands and supports which are processed by the political system, and the outputs of the processing is in the form of
executive actions policy decisions and legislation. The out-
puts of a political system at one moment influences the new
demands and the extent of support to the system in the form of
feed back to the people that inform them how far the system care
for the needs and the sentiments of the people, or a section
of people.

If a political system is regarded to be analogous to a
cybernatic or information processing system, then we have to
realise the fact that the system has a limited capability
of input and the processing of input in the form of outputs.
The constraints imposed by the limited capability of a system
may lead to the outright rejection of some of the demands by
the people in general or by one section of the people. This
lack of consideration of demands, which is commonly known as
lack of incorporation of a demand in the agenda, may itself be
a source of dissatisfaction for a group of people. It is not
only the limited capacity of the information processing of the
system which is responsible for disappearance of the demand
in the agenda, the pressure from other section of people who
do not want that the demands be considered may also block its
processing.

Political process is a dynamic process and it is rather
difficult to envisage the antecedence-consequence sequence.
However, we can make distinction among the variables involved
in the political process on the basis of 'temporal factors'.
There are some variables which are more quickly influenced as against these there are some variables, such as system-affect, which are outcome and counter-balancing of different forces, and hence, they are not subjected to momentary changes. Among the variables which are considered in the present system, viz., relative deprivation, policy evaluation, and treatment evaluation may be considered as the factors which contribute toward the system-affect which is the reservoir of good-will for the system. The factors which are of more transitory in nature may be considered the causes of the more lasting variables in the sense that their cumulative effect over a period of time may influence the more lasting factors. The more lasting factors in their turn are also considered to be the causes of transitory factors; for example, the dissatisfaction with the policy stance may or may not find expression in violent behaviour depending upon the system affect that is the reservoir of good will which a person has toward the system.

DEPRIVATION

Deprivation refers to the paucity or absence of the resources which has adverse impact on the functioning of the individual. This paucity of the resources is not only responsible for restricting but also play the role of some kind of
perpetual stressful situation which is not only to be coped with but is also to be reacted in different ways including the feeling of worthlessness hostility or even over aggression. The nonavailability of resources required for leading a better life, however, is not that important as the comparison which one makes with others and as a consequence of which he finds himself dispossessed of many a thing which he ought to have.

The term relative deprivation (RD) was first used by Samuel Stouffer and his colleagues at the research division of the information branch of the U.S. Army in 1949. They used it in their classic study 'American Soldier'. They employed it as an ad hoc explanation for occasional surprising finding that respondents who were better off objectively in some situations were actually worse off subjectively than comparison groups. Since then three comprehensive and detailed theories of RD (Davis, 1959; Gurr, 1970; Runciman, 1966, 1972, 1974) have been articulated.

Davis (1959) was the first to develop a formal theory of RD. According to his formulation, an individual who lacks a desired goal or opportunity 'X', experiences a sense of injustice whenever he perceives that similar other possess 'X'. Strongly implied in his theory is the notion that the individual who perceives that similar others possess 'X' feels entitled to possess 'X' himself. The
necessary determinants of felt deprivation, then according to Davis, are that the individual who lacks 'X' must perceive that a similar other has X, wants 'X' and feels entitled to X. When any one of these elements is lacking, deprivation does not occur.

Runciman (1966) added a fourth determinant to Davis's three determinants. According to him the individual must think it is feasible to obtain X. Inclusion of fourth determinant, according to Runciman, allows a distinction between unrealistic hopes or day dreams, on the one hand, which do not lead to felt deprivation, and reality based aspirations on the other hand, which do lead to felt deprivation. He also differentiated between egoistic deprivation which occurs when one individual compares himself to others and fraternal deprivation which occurs when one individual compares his own reference groups to other groups.

In contrast to Runciman, Gurr (1970) claimed that an individual experiences deprivation or a sense of grievance only when he thinks that it is not feasible to obtain X. Gurr claimed that

\[
RD = \frac{\text{Value expectations} - \text{Value capabilities}}{\text{Value expectations}}
\]

Value expectations are those goods and opportunities that the individual wants and which he feels entitled to based on comparison with similar others (including himself in the past). Value capabilities are those goods and opportunities that the individual possess or thinks that he can possess.
Crosby (1976) in an attempt to integrate the various theories of RD in one system developed a highly articulated and explicit model of RD known as egoistical relative deprivation. This model distinguishes between environmental determinants, intervening variables and resultant behaviour. The environmental determinants are the causes of RD. The intervening variables occur at three stages: pre-conditions of RD, RD, RD and mediating variables. The pre-conditions are essential elements of RD. RD does not occur unless all preconditions are present. The mediating variables specify the contingencies by which felt deprivation is translated into the various resultant behaviour.

Hoselitz and Willner (1962) link deprivation with the potential for revolution. They distinguish between deprivation and disappointment. According to them "unrelated aspirations produce feelings of disappointment, but unrealized expectations result in feeling of deprivation. Disappointment is generally tolerable, the deprived individual feels impelled to remedy, by whatever means are available, whereas the disappointed individual may breed the needs of inceptive revolution, deprivation serves as a catalyst for revolutionary action" (p.363).

The concept of relative deprivation and similar other concepts which take into consideration the perception of gaps between individual's expected and actual satisfaction of
needs and the comparison of one's quality of life with acquaintants have been found useful in understanding the phenomena of political discontent rebellion and violence. Seligmann and Simpson (1977) observed that the causal chain connecting objective socio-economic conditions with actual political behaviour is long and serious. But it is attitudes, beliefs and values, status frustration, and alienation, rather than structural conditions per se that ultimately produce political violence.

The concepts of just deserts frustration and subjective rank disequilibrium, which like relative deprivation are also based on comparison of oneself with others, have been considered in the studies of political discontent and its fallouts. Just deserts denotes the feeling contingent upon equating the existing quality of life with what a person considers himself to be rightly entitled to. In fact, it is the comparison of expectations defined by a person's best possible level of a need (one's aspiration) or expectation defined by comparison of oneself with one's best of acquaintances (one's reference group). Expectations are equated with that level of a need which a person feels rightfully entitled.

The subjective rank disequilibrium take into consideration the disparity in the status or rank which an individual can achieve in certain areas of life, but fails to achieve in other areas of life while it is expected that there should
be parity between the two. Rank disequilibrium is a condition of imbalance or inconsistency between dimensions of social stratification, for example, people with a high level of education and a high occupational status are in a state of rank equilibrium, but rank disequilibrium is experienced by people whose occupational status is significantly less than that which they are qualified by education. Galtung (1964) assumes that people desire a condition of rank equilibrium, and rank disequilibrium produces frustration.

However, in determining rank disequilibrium some dimensions of social stratification are more salient than others. Imbalances especially between educational rank and such other dimensions, as occupational status and associated material rewards will lead to an intolerable gap. Galtung refers to people with this kind of rank disequilibrium as an 'intellectual proletariat' and he argues that a recipe for resolution is to expand university education in a society where few positions commensurate with such education are available, and thus to increase the size of the intellectual proletariat.

These two concepts, just deserts frustration and subjective rank disequilibrium, enable us to consider the process of social comparison in the context of different concrete
situation of life just like housing condition, medical care, and the feeling that a person could not get as much respect and honour or wealth as is commensurate with his level of education.

POLICY, EVALUATION, AND TRUST

Keeping in view the demands made by different sections of society and its own ideology and political programme, the government formulates policies in respect of important issues. These policies are executed by the bureaucracy and other institutions set up for implementing the policy decisions. Both the policies per se and their implementation by the government officials play an important role in forming the opinion of those who are influenced by the decisions in terms of advantages and disadvantages accruing from the policies and their implementations. Even when a contact between a citizen and a government official is not a situation of policy enforcement but is a routine situation involving rules and regulations, protection of fundamental rights, fulfillment of responsibility or discharge of duties by a government official, the citizen may have a positive or negative feeling toward the official and through him toward the government official, state or the system. The experience of different sections of people vis-a-vis government officials may not be the same either because the government officials
do not accord same kind of treatment to people belonging to different social categories or because the feeling of the citizen that his affiliation with certain social categories would render him to be discriminated against. Irrespective of the reasons of citizen's evaluation of the treatment meted out to him by the agents of the government, citizens' evaluation contributes toward the building or undermining of trust of citizens toward the system.

No government yet established has had the loyalty and trust of all its citizens. Regardless of the popularity of its leaders or of how careful they are in soliciting opinions and encouraging participation in the process of policy-making, there are always those who see inequalities and injustices in the society and harbor suspicions about the government's motives and intentions. For democratic governments the problem of combating distrust and encouraging voluntary acceptance of its institutions and decisions is a paramount concern. One of the basic tenets of democracy is the strong emphasis on voluntary consent both as a basis of political obligation and as a central attribute of citizenship.

Democracy's guiding ideal is the substitution of mutual understanding and agreement for coerciveness and arbitrary authority in all phases of social and political life. The existence of distrustful citizens who are
convinced that the government serves the interests of a few rather than the interests of all, is a barrier to the realization of democratic ideal. Leaders in a representative democracy cannot be successful until they have gained the trust of the citizens. The level of trust in government is an important determinant of political change. The rise and fall in the number of distrustful citizens over time is a sensitive barometer of social conflicts and tensions. Rising distrust is often a stimulant to social change, but its consequences depend on the response it evokes from leaders and other elements of the society.

Given the widely acknowledged importance of political trust in maintaining political stability or promoting change, it is surprising that empirical research on the origin and consequences of trust is so scarce. Sometimes political trust is clearly related to social status and sometimes not. Often it is correlated with the feelings of political efficacy but not always. In most instances it is strongly related to measures of trust in other people but again not always.

Some of the above contradictions are due to the fact that the reported research has taken place in different settings. The levels of trust vary according to what Litt (1963) has called the "political mileue" in which distrust may be acquired as a community norm, a part of the political
acculturation process in the city's daily routine. Not only can the "political mileu" influence the level of trust but the relationship between the variables are not always the same in each setting.

Gamson (1961) says it is possible for individuals simultaneously to feel high confidence in political institutions and alienation towards those who man them. In fact, according to Gamson it is important to find out whether political trust is generalized. In the simplest case people dissatisfied with a given decision or set of decisions first begin to distrust the authorities then perhaps the institutions and procedure of the regime; and finally they become so disenchanted with the political community itself that they wish to separate themselves from the community. Where trust is high, a negative decision may be bearable because of a belief in the integrity of the authorities and the legitimacy of the procedures employed. Where trust is low, negative outputs may be unbearable and lead to an intensification of distrust or separatist feelings. The existence of high levels of trust allows authorities to make commitments which build more trust and weather situations in which citizens are unhappy about governmental outputs. A distrustful citizenary, however, is suspicious of every governmental move, impatient for results and prone to more deeper and extreme levels of distrust.
Ultimately this process may lead to acts which undermine the political system.

There are two general approaches explaining political trust. Gamson, for example, emphasizes political factors. The content of decisions and the reactions they provoke are seen by him as the basic sources of political trust-distrust. Other scholars (Litt, 1963; Aberbach and Walker, 1967) stress personality factors, which are basically independent of political factors, as the explanatory variables. They believe that if one cannot trust other people generally, one can certainly not trust those under the temptation of, and with the powers which come with public office. Trust in elected officials is seen to be a more specific instance of trust in mankind.

Litt (1963) has introduced the idea that both political and personality variables are potentially important in explaining the factors of trust. The relative importance of each class of variables depends on the political environment or milieu prevailing over the community being examined. Stokes (1962) draws attention to the importance of generalized political expectations born of widely held democratic values as influences for political trust.

Aberbach and Walker (1967) conceive of a process in which the basic orientation toward the system slowly
changes as individuals are subjected to outside influences. In Gamson's model, for example, the individual's level of distrust is based on his judgement of the contents of political outputs important to him and the procedures used to reach the decisions. These judgements accumulate through time and are affected by cues from his experiences with government and his group allegiances. For a person with a high level of trust, a bad decision may be seen as an understandable, if unfortunate, mistake which does not call the political system's legitimacy into serious question. For a person with a moderate level of trust, however, the same bad decision is more likely to serve as proof of fundamental fault in the political system and may precipitate a rapid decrease in political trust. For the already distrustful person, the bad decision is merely further proof that the system is evil and may move him to some extreme, perhaps violent protest.

The relationship of the sense of political efficacy, socio-economic background and political milieu on the one hand, and political trust on the other, have been studied by a number of behavioural scientists. The simple logical assumption that those who have the confidence and skill to influence the political process would have more political trust, is not unequivocally confirmed by the findings. In two studies carried out by Stokes (1958 and 1963) political
trust was found to be significantly related with political efficacy. However, the significant relationship between the two variables was reported by Litt (1964) for one of the sample, i.e., Brooklyne sample, but not for the other sample, i.e., Boston Sample. The unstable relationship between political efficacy and political trust can be attributed to the differences in the background of the subject included in the sample and the political mileue prevailing at the time when the study was carried out. Another simple and plausible explanation regarding variation with respect to political trust, that socially advantaged group having status and social skills that bring them social reward would be more trustful could not be confirmed by Aberbach and Walker (1966) who reported virtually no relationship between indicators of social advantages such as education, occupation and political trust. They, however, do not rule out the possibility of indirect effect of such factors on political trust. The factors which were found by Aberbach and Walker to be of more importance in determining the political trust are certain background factors which have to do with acculturation patterns. Such factors include the place of birth and active affiliation with the church. Aberbach and Walker reported that those who were born in south of U.S.A. were more trusting than those who were born in the north; those having active church affiliation were found to be more trusting than those
who had passive affiliation with the church.

**SYSTEM AFFECT**

System affect is the sum total of an individual's feelings toward the nation, its virtues, accomplishments, political institutions and the like. System affect which is often equated with patriotism is to be regarded as a reservoir of good will and trust which may enable the state to take unpopular decisions if needed in the interest of the nation. It is the availability of this reservoir of good will that sustain the state in the time of crises and helps in steering it out of the trouble water. System affect is to be differentiated from one of its important components, namely output affect. Output affect is the attitude people have toward the executive or administrative agencies that enforce laws, and towards regulations affecting them. Output affect has to do with that part of political system in which people have predominantly passive role. In addition to the feeling about the enactment of general public policies, output affect includes the feeling people have about the agencies and the processes that are involved in the election of public officials.

As mentioned above, being a sum total of feeling towards different aspects of polity, system affect is contributed by
all the variables which have been discussed in earlier sections, namely deprivation, satisfaction-dissatisfaction with the policies of the government, trust in the political institutions and their incumbents, and the evaluation of the treatment received from the different agencies of the government with which an ordinary citizen has to deal with.

Perhaps the greatest source of system affect is the existence of link between the primary structure of the community and the political system. Almond and Verba (1964) are of the view that the flow of impulses, needs and demands and preferences from the individual and his primary group to the political institutions is possible only through the media of political interests which are analogous to the veins and arteries of a circulation system.

An effectively functioning democracy implies that a substantial proportion of its members are involved in the political system through the meshing of the more diffuse structures of the community with the more differentiated ones of the polity. Only through the engagement of family and community by the polity can the impulses, needs, complaints and aspirations of the average man flow into the polity and influence the form and content of political debate and policy making. The flow of demands and claims is sustained in a flow of feeling pleasure in attaining one's ends or in the excitement of a political
contest, anger over political defeat, frustration at the chicanery of the politicians, contempt over demogogy, dishonesty or corruption. The tissue of a democracy in which the primary structures are well articulated with the secondary ones has the flush of health, the "tone" of a good circulation. (Almond and Verba, 1964).

Where for one reason or another, the political system fails to integrate with the intimate community structures then the demands and feelings do not flow readily into the political system and the polity may lose touch with the intimate moods and needs of its members. People may withdraw emotionally from the political system or relate themselves to it by passively accepting the displacements, projections and other irrationalities of extremist movements. This undermines the system affect.

Different variables discussed above are not to be regarded as independent of each other; they are rather different aspect of social situations with its own dynamic and cumulative processes determining an individual's or group's alienation from the political system. Obviously, none of the variable is supposed to have exclusive and direct effect on the dependent variable. Perhaps, much influence of the predictors is likely to be indirect, that is to be mediated by other variables.